

REMARKS

The claims have not been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-16 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 1 and 9 are independent claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

Drawing Amendments

In the Office Action, the drawings were objected to because Figure 1 was not labeled "Prior Art". Figure 1 has been amended to be labeled "Prior Art" as shown in the attached drawing sheets. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection.

Figure 3B has been amended by changing "Lroff" to "Lgoff" per paragraphs [0038-0040] of the specification.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,366,025 B1 issued to Yamada ("Yamada"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) to be proper, a single reference must disclose every claimed feature. To be patentable, a claim need only recite a single novel feature that is not disclosed in the cited reference. Thus, the failure of a cited reference to disclose one or more claimed features renders the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection improper.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 must be withdrawn because Yamada fails to disclose every feature of claim 1. Specifically, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels of the R, G, and B unit pixels each include a offset region with a different geometric structure between the multi gates from one another.

Yamada fails to disclose at least these features. The Examiner relies upon Yamada's different colored emissive areas, which have different sizes from each other, to teach the transistors of claim 1. Applicants disagree.

Yamada's emissive areas 1B, 1R, and 1G do not disclose the transistors of claim 1. Rather, emissive areas 1B, 1R, and 1G define the areas in which light is emitted from the red, green, and blue pixels, respectively. Yamada further teaches that the emissive areas 1B, 1R, and 1G may be formed to have different sizes by "changing the size of the area of the anodes 161 of the organic EL elements" (col. 8, lines 32-33) or by "forming the anodes 161 with areas having identical sizes, and then covering the end of anodes 161 with a planarization insulating film 167 that is formed prior to the emissive element layer so as to change the size of the contact area between the anode and the emissive element layer...." (col. 8, lines 33-38). Thus, emissive areas 1B, 1R, and 1G fail to teach any characteristics of the transistors in the pixels. Furthermore, Yamada states that Figure 5 shows "[t]he basic cross-sectional configuration of *each R, G, and B display pixel*." (col. 6, lines 53-54; emphasis added). Consequently, although Yamada teaches different sized emissive areas in the pixels, the first TFT 30 and the second TFT 40 respectively have the same configuration in the red, green, and blue pixels. Accordingly, Yamada fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels of the R, G, and B unit pixels each include a offset region with a different geometric structure between the multi gates from one another."

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claim 1. Claims 3-8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable at least for this reason.

Since none of the other prior art of record discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 9-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Yamada in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,529,213 issued to Kimura *et al.* ("Kimura"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), four factual inquiries must be examined. The four factual inquiries include (a) determining the scope and contents of the prior art; (b) ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims in issue; (c) resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (d) evaluating evidence of secondary consideration. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17-18 (1966). In view of these four factors, the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be made explicit, and should "identify a reason that would have prompted a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field to combine the [prior art] elements" in the manner claimed. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, slip op. at 14-15 (2007).

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is allowable over Yamada and Kimura fails to cure the deficiencies of Yamada noted above with regard to claim 1. Hence, claim 2 is allowable at least because it depends from an allowable claim 1.

With regard to claims 9-12, the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein transistors of at least two unit pixels among the R, G, and B unit pixels each include an offset region having a different resistance value between the multi gates from one another

Yamada in view of Kimura fails to disclose at least this feature of claim 9. As discussed above, Yamada discloses pixels having different light emitting areas, but not transistors having different offset regions. Kimura fails to cure this deficiency in Yamada.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 9. Claims 10-12 depend from claim 9 and are allowable at least for this reason. Since none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submit that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/hae-chan park/

Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: August 7, 2007

CUSTOMER NUMBER: 58027

H.C. Park & Associates, PLC
8500 Leesburg Pike
Suite 7500
Vienna, VA 22182
Tel: 703-288-5105
Fax: 703-288-5139
HCP/SLK/tmk